DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 026 907 FL 001 123

By-Walsh, Donald

The Four Fundamental Skills.

Pub Date 5 Nov 65

Note-10p.; Speech presented at the Foreign Language Conference, Gearhart, Oregon, November 5, 1965.

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.60

Descriptors-Audiolingual Methods, Cultural Context, Grammar Translation Method, Language Instruction, Language Laboratories, *Language Skills, Linguistics, Literature, *Modern Languages, Oral Communication, Programed Instruction, *Second Language Learning, Structural Analysis, *Teacher Role, *Teaching Methods

Trends, developments, and special needs in foreign language instruction are discussed in this speech. Priority is given to a definition and evaluation of the language skills, and suggestions are included for mastering listening, speaking, reading, and writing aspects of second languages. Related topics of culture, literature, linguistics, language laboratories, and teacher role conclude the presentation. (AF)

ED029907

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Division of Instruction
Special Consultant Services
Public Service Building
Salem, Oregon 97310

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE FOUR FUNDAMENTAL SKILLS

Speech by Donald Walsh: Former Program Director of Modern Foreign Languages of the Modern Language Association; delivered at FL Conference, Gearhart, Oregon, November 5, 1965.

I doubt that foreign language teachers in the 1960's will be surprised to know that there are four language skills. There has been some growth in their number. Not so many years ago there seemed to be only two: READING and WRITING, which often merged into the single two-way skill of translation. Those of use who are old enough remember, perhaps fondly, those years when our students plowed dutifully through the classics of French or German or Spanish literature, converting great foreign prose in poetry into juvenile English at a steady rate of five pages a day. The translation days were periodically interrupted by grammar days when we attempted to communicate to our students our love for syntactical irregularities and then tested them with artfully contrived sentences such as, "If Professor Martin had known that Dr. Brown intended to leave for Southern France the next morning, he would have asked him to take little Peter with him." Thirteen traps in that one sentence! And how bittersweet we were as we graded the papers and discovered that most of the students had fallen into most of the traps.

By a strange inversion or perversion of pedagogical thinking, a teacher's success in those days seemed to be measured not by the success of his students, but by their failure. But then came World War II and the discovery that there was a need for language skills beyond reading and writing. And we had the ASTP, and memorized dialogues, and patterned practice, and native informants, and descriptive linguistics and mimicry memorization, and language laboratories. We had two new skills, LISTENING and SPEAKING, and we were learning to guide the student along paths of habit formation that would prevent his making errors instead of leading him into temptation. This was the misnamed audio-lingual method, twice misnamed. First, because it's not a method, but an emphasis; and second, because it creates the impression that a language is only sound. On the lips of audio-lingual extremists it is, indeed, often sound and fury signifying nothing. We grant, more we proclaim that the initial emphasis in learning a language must be placed on listening comprehension and on speaking, but we must not stop with these two skills. I should like to see the term "audio-lingual" disappear since it emphasizes an extremist position, and I should like to replace it with the phrase "Four Fundamental Skills," FFS instead of ALM which, by the way, has the additional disadvantage of being associated with a single set of teaching materials. I digress a moment to state that MLA (The Modern Language Association) has nothing whatever to do with the ALM although they use the same letters in reverse. The tests that were produced under the sponsorship of the MLA, the MLA proficiency tests for teachers and advanced students and the MLA Foreign Cooperative Foreign Language Tests, are not tied to any particular set of teaching materials. The MLA is then not the ALM, and the ALM is not the MLA.

It is a cliché now, although a relatively new one, that language is communication. We know that most of the world's languages have not yet been put into written form, and that in all languages speech came long before writing and can get along very

FL 001 123

well without writing. We know that the blind can learn to talk as well as the sighted and that even the sighted can talk in pitch black darkness. This is all very true and very important, and it was because we were ignorant of this truth, or indifferent to it, that our teaching of languages was so incomplete and most of it so ineffective. We repeat, Language is communication, but we must pursue the thought and ask what the communication communicates. Once we have taught our students to talk the language, what do they say? Is what they say worth the effort of having learned to say it in a foreign tongue? And is what they have learned to hear with understanding worth hearing? And since in most of the languages that are studied in the United States, some of the communication is written communication, we may legitimately ask if what is read is worth reading. If the study of foreign languages is to be justified as a legitimate and essential part of a liberal education at the college level and even at the secondary school level, we must pay attention not only to the communication skills but also to the cultural and intellectual content of the communication. Not even the FOUR FUNDAMENTAL SKILLS are sufficient unto themselves.

There is an analogy here, although not a perfect one, between learning a language and learning to type. For most students-- and for people in general--what one types is more important than how one types, unless the typer happens to be a typist. For non-typist typers content is more important than form. What is being communicated is more important that the way it is communicated, unless the form is so wretchedly poor that it interferes with communication. The same analogy can be made even more strikingly with regard to handwriting, some of which can completely block communication. The linguistic parallel to the typist might be the professional translator or interpreter, but even here we know that the effectiveness of this person increases in direct proportion as he adds to his control of the language a familiarity with the literatures and cultures of both countries.

We have learned a great deal in recent years about how to teach listening and speaking; we are still groping for ways to teach reading and writing, and this is ironic because years ago we thought we knew all about how to teach these skills. Some of our students--to be sure, the best ones, those who succeed despite their teacher--did manage to take that giant step from deciphering to reading. But they (and we) never quite figured out how it happened. Since translation is a mental process that is almost the direct opposite of reading, it would seem to offer few possibilities as a technique by which to learn to read. How can we prevent our students from translating and from vocabulary thumbing? How can we get them to read directly in their second language as they read directly in their first language? They do read English without translation into a foreign language and their English teachers seem able to test student comprehsnion of reading without recourse to another language. Yet time and again we hear foreign language teachers say that without translation into English the teacher simply can't find out whether the student has understood what he has read. I grant that it takes more work and ingenuity, more homework by the teacher, to find this out without recourse to translation, but it's worth the effort. What must we do? First, we must seek out reading materials in which the burden of new words to be learned is not overwhelming, not more than a few new words to the page. Second, we must teach the student how to make intelligent guesses at new words, how to infer their meaning from the context, which is the way that we have all learned and are still learning most of our vocabulary in our first language.

What percentage of all the English words that you now know did you ever have to look up in a dictionary? And we must give the student all the best techniques for learning the words and phrases that he does have to look up so that he will not have to look them up again and again and again. An essential feature of intermediate and advanced language learning must be a gigantic expansion of the student's vocabulary. He must learn a tremendous number of words and expressions and learn them so thoroughly that the word or expression is understood directly without any need to bring the English equivalent to mind. To have any chance of success in this difficult task the student must be able to concentrate on the foreign words, not on their so-called English equivalents. He must focus all his attention on the shape and the sound of these words. And this brings me back to the initial emphasis on listening and speaking. In the very beginning these two skills should be our exclusive concern. Listening and speaking are not an approach to language learning; they are the backbone of the process.

One of the criteria for judging an inferior textbook, for example, is whether all the material and pronunciation are polished off in the introduction. When they are safely out of the way, real language learning can begin in lesson one so when we come to reading and vocabulary building, we have a chance to guide or misguide the student. Without our persistent and constant intervention he will tend to learn new words, not as sequences of sound but as strings of letters, an error that will enormously complicate his task. How large would our vocabularies be if you had to think of the present occasion as a F-O-R-E-I-G-N L-A-N-G-U-A-G-E C-O-N-F-E-R-E-N-C-E in G-E-A-R-H-A-R-T, O-R-E-G-O-N. But this is the way most students learn vocabulary--or don't learn it. We know that everyone reading his native language subconsciously verbalizes what he reads, and that the verbalizing rises closer to the level of consciousness as the conceptual difficulty of the reading increases. We may take it for granted that most of our students in reading a foreign language will have linguistic difficulties that will parallel these conceptual difficulties, and that they will therefore use a great deal of verbalization. To put it another way, we may hope that our students will not be lip readers, mouthing the words they read; but we do know that all readers are to some extent ear readers. They do hear what they read, and it is up to us as language teachers to try to make sure that what they more or less consciously verbalize bears a reasonable resemblance to the verbalization of a native speaker of the language.

We have been told that language is an essential element of culture. And this concept may puzzle us if we think of culture as museums and cathedrals, Louis XIV furniture, and the Sacré Coeur, the Escorial, and the Giralda, Unter der Linten, and the Brandenberg Gate or the Leaning Tower, and the Duomo. But it is not this culture to which we refer; it is not this culture of which language is an essential part. We must distinguish between two concepts of culture. One concentrates our attention on the monuments of the past and the present, the achievements of which a people can be most proud whether literary, philosophical, ethical, musical, artistic, or architectural. The other concept of culture, a much more recent concept and one much less clearly perceived, tries to discover those elements in the traditions and beliefs, scale of values, and behavior patterns of a people that cause it to react to reality in a distinctive way. Why, for example, does the Frenchman or Spaniard react in a different way from the Englishman or American or German to such matters as sports, food, living in the country, politics, or love? And how would the Spaniard react differently from the Frenchman or from the Spanish-American, and the Englishman from the German, or from the North American and the Northeastener from the northwesterner? These are large questions to which we have, up to now, only small and sporadic answers.

These two concepts of culture are so different that they can really not properly be described by the same label. We need to speak of "big culture" with a capital C, and "little culture." Another and more perceptive distinction is "broad culture," perhaps on the analogy that traveling and sightseeing is broadening. And "deep culture." "Deep culture" has been the subject of a few pioneering works. Salvador de Madariaga, a generation ago, wrote an acute psychological analysis of three peoples in his ENGLISHMEN, FRENCHMEN, SPANIARDS. More recent landmarks in cultural analysis are Lawrence Wylie's VILLAGE IN THE VAUCLUSE, the study of a French town; Pitt River's PEOPLE OF THE SIERRA, on Southern Spain; and Oscar Lewis's three books on MEXICO--FIVE FAMILIES; THE CHILDREN OF SANCHEZ; and PEDRO MARTINEZ. We are in desperate need of more such works and of a central concept of what constitutes a culture. Howard Lee Nostrand of the University of Washington has made an effort-making analysis of the means by which a culture may be analyzed, and our hope is that the wisdom expressed in all these works will be reflected in a higher degree of accuracy and sophistication in our textbooks, both the basic texts and the readers. The need for enlightened cultural contrasts is urgent because the contrasts are being made every day, wisely or unwisely, in every foreign language class discussion in whatever language it takes place. Professor Nelson Brooks of Yale, author of LANGUAGE AND LANGUAGE LEARNING, once likened some language teaching to that of a ski instructor who teaches his students not how to ski but how to become ski instructors.

We teachers of language and literature like to see in our students images of ourselves. We are teachers in this field principally because we are fascinated by the study of language and literature. The emphasis on research in American higher education gives a special attraction to the minor writer or to the minor works of a native major writer, to the exceptions to the rules, and the exceptions to the exceptions, and to the unusual lexical item, I am reminded of a story that a Danish visitor to my office told me. He was visiting a French class in Denmark and the teacher, doing an explication de texte, asked the class to pay special attention to one word and to make a special effort to learn it because it was so rare that they might never see it again. Now, language for its own sake is only for the linguists and the lexicographer. And we must guard against the temptation to assume that all our students share these special interests. Beyond studying a language lies reading and studying in a language. It is our responsibility to try to bring the student to the point where he can react in the foreign language to all the elements in a foreign culture in a way that approximates the reactions of a native of the culture.

Now culture, deep culture, embraces many things including literature; but it is not identical with literature. Most of us language teachers majored in a foreign language in college, and a foreign language major was automatically a foreign literature major in those days before linguistics became an alternative major for the student interested in languages. So we language students studied literature and grew to love it. If we didn't love it, we got out of foreign languages as soon as we could and majored in some other field and maybe now we're teaching languages anway. But most of us here, and most foreign language teachers everywhere by this process of natural selection, include an artifically high percentage of literature lovers. Now there is nothing wrong, nothing immoral about a love for literature. And there is nothing immoral in a teacher who tries to hand on to his students his own love for literature. But if the teacher assumes that because a student is in a foreign language class he is automatically in love with literature or even knows what literature is, he is befuddling his communication with his class and he is placing at a disadvantage those members of the class whose intellectual interests

do not lie in literature but in psychology, history, political science, or natural science. We must remind ourselves that books, and good books, in all these fields have been written in foreign languages, and it is our responsibility, as interpreters of the culture of the country whose language we teach, to make books in these fields available to those among our students who have a special interest and knowledge in them.

Not long ago I heard an eminent Germanist tell of a colleague who was furious because one of his students came to class unprepared in his Goethe assignment and offered as the excuse that he had got absorbed reading Einstein in German. "Dummkopf." Now you may object that you are specialists in literature, not in these other fields, and that it is the teachers in these other courses who should be guiding student reading in their specialties. The weakness in this line of reasoning is that it assumes that only the language and literature major, created in his teacher's image, will every voluntarily take a language course that goes beyond the minimum that meets the college entrance or the graduation requirement. The assumption here is that any student who is not a language major will drop his language study as soon as he is allowed to do so. This is a craven and defeatist attitude. Let us be bolder, more sanguine. Let us assume that our language students will have the desire and the ability to read and discuss in the foreign language a variety of subjects, each according to his tastes. And let us therefore introduce them, by means of outside reading and the school or college library shelves, to some basic books in the language we teach and in the fields that appeal to them.

We may even look at a broader horizon and consider the day when students will have mastered the FOUR FUNDAMENTAL SKILLS so well that they can study in the language. This day has already arrived on some campuses and in some schools. An art course is being given in Spanish at the University of Kansas; a biology course in a junior high school near Seattle. In Acovel College in California all the instruction is in Spanish from algebra to zoology.

The Foreign Language Program of the MLA, which I had the honor to direct for six years, pioneered in many advances in language learning. I believe that one of its major successes was the role it played in bringing descriptive linguists and language teachers into closer contact. Linguistics is a realtively new, distinctly 20th Century, science. It began as anthropologists attempted to describe and transcribe languages that had no written systems, languages spoken by the American Indians, by Sub-Sahara and African peoples, by Southeast Asians. They transcribed the sounds of each language and by trial and error assembled a description of its syntactic structure. In many cases they have preserved for history descriptions of languages that had only a few living speakers, languages that would have disappeared without a trace when these speakers died. In the process of analyzing the very complicated languages of many of these so-called "primitive" peoples, linguists came to know a great deal about language itself, and they began to apply their knowledge to the study of English primarily as an aid to speakers of other languages all over the world who are studying English.

Now, there were hundreds, thousands of books on English grammar written for all the native speakers of the language who had suffered through them as they struggled upward through the grades. Somehow, despite the books, most native speakers of English have managed to learn to speak the language. But very few of us, even today, even after we have mastered one or two foreign languages, have a clear idea

of the sound system and the structure of our own language. Very few of us are conscious of the importance of English intonational patterns. You're skeptical? Here are two examples: "What are you eatin' chicken?" or "What are we having for dinner? Mother?" Another distinction that few of us have ever noted is in interrogative sentence patterns. Traditional grammars give paradigms the declarative and interrogative forms: I speak, you speak, he, she, it speaks; do I speak, do you speak, does he, she, it speak, and so on. They rarely point out that most affirmative statements can be made into questions simply by changing the inflection. "Did she buy the book?" or, "She bought the book?" "Does the speaker bore you?" or, "The speaker bores you?" "Do you want to go home?" or, "You want to go home?" Now, this variant interrogative form is perfectly standard English, but if we tried to use it with a sentence that begins with an interrogative word, we get substandard English. "Where she bought the book?" "Why the speaker bores you?" "When you want to go home?" And note that this variant form does not work at all with a negative statement. "Don't you like this speech?" is quite different from, "You don't like this speech?" The only alternative to "Don't you like this speech?" is "You like this speech, don't you?" Accenting the positive, you see.

Now why is this all important? Are these distinctions not very prosaic? Indeed they are--to native speakers of English. Like Monsieur Jourdain in Le bourgeois gentilhomme, you have been using these variants correctly all your life without being aware of your skill; but the foreigner learning English with conventional teaching materials has had little or no guidance in such manners. The descriptive linguists have now come to his aid and they have come, finally (and this brings me to my point), to the aid of the foreign language teacher.

The Modern Language Association at least fifteen years ago began to wonder what the linguist could teach the teacher of French, German, or Spanish - the regular classroom teacher. But the linguists weren't at all interested in classroom problems. They were busily analyzing exotic languages on field trips to the Great Plains or the African jungle and veldt. They had invented a whole new vocabulary of terms, or rather several new vocabularies (one for each linguist) to describe their discoveries. They liked being unintelligible and couldn't care less about any practical application of their findings. And when, despite their indifference, a branch of linguistics came into being with the name of Applied Linguistics, they reacted with as much condescension as would a professor of English literature to the thought of a course in journalism or business English. Nevertheless, patience and gentle prodding brought a gradual improvement.

The establishment in Washington D.C. in 1959 of the Center of Applied Linguistics under the auspices of the Modern Language Association was a major factor in strengthening lines of communication between linguist and language teacher. Under the direction of Charles Ferguson of the Center for Applied Linguistics, a series of volumes is now in preparation contrasting the sound system and the grammatical structure of American English with those of the major languages of Europe--French, German, Italian, Russian, and Spanish. They are being published by the University of Chicago Press. For each of the contrasted languages there are two volumes. Those for German and Spanish have already appeared, and the volumes for Italian are promised this fall.

These are basic and pioneering works for the foreign language teacher. They are not perfect--pioneers rarely are--but they are the best existing descriptions of these languages and of the special problems they offer to the native speaker of

English. These are published by the University of Chicago Press. If you're interested, just write and ask for a brochure on the Contrastive Series published under the direction of the Center for Applied Linguistics.

Teaching the language skills takes a lot of drilling and practice. And not all of it needs to be done directly by the language teacher. Two devices are coming increasingly to his aid. The older one is the language laboratory; the newer one is the concept of programed instruction. The language laboratory was unfortunately named. It should have been called something like "a speech library." Much nonsense has been written about it both pro and contra. It really appeared on our horizon too soon, long before the engineers knew how to build it to our needs, long before most of us knew what our needs were or how to meet them. Our chances of effective use of the laboratory are measurably improving now that better lab materials are being published as integrated parts of the new courses. But the big problem is still not how good the lab is but how well it is used.

I once made a comparison between language labs and swimming pools that I think pertinent to repeat at this point. Since the language lab is designed to give the student maximal opportunity to practice talking, it would be unintelligent to use it for reading or writing or group listening practice or to schedule a class for a single thirty-minute period a week--five minutes to get to the lab, five minutes to adjust the equipment, ten minutes of practice, five minutes to put away the equipment, five minutes to get back to class--or to use a traditional, silent era text without integrated audio-lingual drills, or to put in the hands of teachers who are puzzled or frightened by mechanical devices. It would be correspondingly unintelligent to install the diving board over the shallow end of the swimming pool, or to install it over the deep end and use so little water that the deep end becomes a shallow end, or to teach the students to exhale in the air and inhale in the water, or to swim up and down instead of forth and back. The language lab, like the swimming pool, is simply a place that facilitates certain learning practices. We must be careful not to confuse the place with the practices.

The analogy between learning a language and learning to play a musical instrument has been made several times. It's an interesting one, though far from perfect. For one thing, it's a long time before the music student can produce anything that sounds at all like music, whereas the language student can produce limited but quite accurate language from his very first lesson. Another difference is that we think of music as mainly communication from musician to audience, one way communication, although there is a very significant interplay of instruments and not merely informal ducts and the like. Musicians do talk musically to one another, but when they talk to the audience we don't get a chance to talk back musically, although I am sure that hearty applause is music to the musician's ear. But there is one respect in which practicing a foreign language is like practicing music. Not all the practicing has to be done in the presence of the teacher. We would think it a great waste of time if a pupil's piano teacher had to sit by his side every day as he practiced his scales. As we know, this doesn't happen. Junior practices daily all by himself, and once or twice a week he goes to his teacher to show off what he has learned and to hear and watch teacher play the new piece that he's going to learn.

And so with language learning. And here, programed instruction will come to our aid. You note the future tense <u>will</u> come. The techniques of programing are still

very crude and most of the experimentation has been in the direction of self-instructional courses involving no live teaching at all, and I trust that no shudders of apprehension will be noted at this point in the audience.

Someone has rightly said that any teacher who can be replaced by a machine ought to be replaced by a machine. But there is an urgent need for completely self-instructional courses to be used by mature students who need to learn a neglected and critical language as quickly and effectively as possible even when they cannot make contact with the teacher of the language. The irony is that it would have been much easier to prepare self-instructional materials for an "old-fashioned, two-skilled, reading-writing course" than for a course that stresses listening and speaking and reading and structure. No teaching machine has yet been invented that will converse with a student and correct his errors. But machines have been made that will emit correct and incorrect foreign sounds and ask the learner to tell which sounds are correct. By pressing a button the learner sees a green light if he pressed correctly and a red light if he didn't. Programed instruction, still very experimental and still fascinated by the problems of creating materials for the self-learner, will in time, I am sure, have much knowledge to contribute to the preparation of materials for the language laboratory.

The whole concept of minimal steps, mastered in sequence, with immediate confirmation of correct response and immediate correction of errors, is essential to laboratory drills. In our rediscovery of listening and speaking we have tended to forget <u>looking</u>, except looking at the textbook. We must make much more imaginative use of visual stimuli in our teaching--opaque and transparent slides with various types of projectors, film-strips, films, and television. Some of the most recent language labs are being constructed with closed-circuit television receivers at each student position so that the learner can see what's being talked about. Films are very expensive to make but they can be superb sources of authentic cultural information. One fruitful suggestion for a school system that owns a documentary film and wants to get maximum returns on its investment is to make a graded series of sound tracks increasing in lexical and structural complexity and in depth of commentary so that the same film can be shown over and over at several stages of the learner's progress.

We tend to divide the FOUR FUNDAMENTAL SKILLS into two pairs, listening-speaking and reading-writing. There is another meaningful division, LISTENING-READING, the receptive and passive skills, and SPEAKING-WRITING, the productive and active skills. In all our language learning, including learning our first language, our <u>receptive</u> or <u>passive</u> vocabulary is much larger than our <u>productive</u> or <u>active</u> vocabulary. We recognize the meaning of thousands of words that we do not normally use. The distance between the passive and the active skills is even greater in a learner's second or third language. The language learner will need to read infinitely more than he writes for he has all the foreign literature and culture to absorb and he will normally have very little to contribute to this culture by his writings. He will also need to be able to understand much more speech than he can produce. He will view and hear foreign films but probably not act in them. As a traveler abroad he will be asking questions, not giving answers; and he will need much intense listening practice to be able to understand the stream or torrent of information that will follow his carefully phrased questions and requests.

Many of you have heard this story, but it admirably illustrates my point. An immigrant arrived in this country unable to speak a word of English, and after a few days he was on the verge of starvation because he couldn't order any food. A friend

taught him to say "Apple-a pie and coffee," and he went off to a restaurant and made happy contact. He communicated. And he got his apple pie and coffee. But after a month or so he was awfully tired of apple pie and coffee so he appealed to his friend who taught him to say, "Ham-a sandwich." Off he went to his restaurant. "Ham-a sandwich." "White or rye?" "Ham-a sandwich." "What kinda bread do you want?" "Ham-a sandwich." "I hear you, Bud, but tell me how you want it. White, whole wheat, rye, pumpernickel?" "Ham-a sandwich." "Look, I got ears. Don't shout. Just tell me how you want it." "Apple-a pie and coffee."

I have said little, so far, about the fourth skill, WRITING, except in a negative way subordinating it to reading. The neglect and the postponement have been intentional. Just as the beginning student should defer his reading until he has a reasonably firm control of the sounds of his new language, so he should postpone his writing experience until he has done a good deal of reading. Writing, of course, means two quite different things--transcribing sounds on paper and conveying thoughts on paper. The first and more elementary kind of writing is a basic skill and there are direct ways to teach it. The errors in pronunciation that the student may fall into as he begins to read will be paralled by errors in transcription as he begins to write, and he will need scientifically constructed drill materials to correct these errors. A second function of this more elementary kind of writing is to reveal to the student the structure of the language that he is studying. Writing exercises of this sort should be strictly controlled, limited to rewriting passages of good prose, changing tense, or person or point of view. Much of this is straight copying which gives the students spelling practice and the beginning of an awareness of style.

The second kind of writing, putting thoughts on paper, ought to be postponed for a long, long time. We language teachers have spent untold hours and years preparing our students for tasks they will rarely or never be asked to perform. No exercise can be less productive for student and teacher than the so-called free composition which tempts the student to invent foreign words and constructions to express his English scented concepts.

I am not naive enough to think that a native speaker of one language often reaches a control of a second language that matches his control of his own language. I think that there are few genuine-built bilinguals produced by even the best of teaching unless the teaching is reinforced by prolonged residence in the foreign country. My definition of genuine fluency in speaking or writing a foreign language is that nobody noticed that the speaker made a detour--nobody saw him duck, in other words. The fluent speaker doesn't come to a dead stop because he suddenly finds that he can't express his idea. He anticipates and avoids the dead end by choosing an alternate means of expression. The dangers of free composition practiced by an elementary or intermediate student is that he will crash blindly through a series of dead ends leaving splinters of fractured language behind him.

THE FOUR FUNDAMENTAL SKILLS are all necessary and are all intertwined. LISTENING and SPEAKING must be followed by READING and WRITING in the study of any of the great languages of the world. But reading and writing can be effectively learned only if the student has a firm command of the sound system. Without such a command

how can he possibly appreciate the literature that is the finest flower of the language. How can he enjoy the esthetic delight that comes from sharing with an author the sound effects that he obtains from choosing certain words and arranging them in certain sequences. These skills, these disciplines are not independent, but interdependent. It is not LISTENING and SPEAKING versus READING and WRITING, not AUDIO-LINGUAL versus VISUAL, not LANGUAGE versus LITERATURE, not LITERATURE versus CULTURE, it is all these together united hand in hand, viewed as the logical components of the whole language experience, the gift of tongues--that faculty that distinguished man from the lesser beasts and is his finest achievement.

DJQ:gn
12-6-65
400